

## REMARKS

### Status of Claims

Claims 1 and 3-18 remain for examination.

### Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 3-4 and 6-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Yonemitsu (6,856,962) in view of Mansour (6,035,278). Claim 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Yonemitsu, Mansour and Van Horne.

The examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 which now recites:

1. (Currently Amended) A schedule information system comprising:

schedule data storage means in which users' schedule data are stored;

information service means, including an internet-based search engine, for providing users with first related information;

related service search means for searching the information service means using said internet-based search engine, for information that relates to the schedule data stored in the schedule data storage means and provides the information as the first related information, said first related information obtained from an internet search based on said user's schedule data using said internet-based search engine; and

information service data storage means for storing second related information summarizing a subject matter of the first related information provided by the information service means;

wherein the related service search means includes means which, in response to users' instructions to search related services or to consult schedule data, acquires the first related information from information service means and outputs the first related information to the users; and

wherein the related service search means includes a means for searching the information service data storage means in response to users' instructions or control; and means for

outputting to the users, along with the schedule data said first and second related information;

said first and second related information being other than schedule data of another user.

As may be seen from the above emphasized portions of the claim, the related service search means is recited as searching the information service means using said internet-based search engine, for information that relates to the schedule data stored in the schedule data storage means and provides the information as the first related information. The first related information is obtained from an internet search based on said user's schedule data using the internet-based search engine. These limitations of claim 1 were already part of claim 1, but have been redrafted to emphasize even more strongly that the first related information is obtained from an internet search based on the user's scheduled data.

Of course, the claims continue to recite the remaining elements discussed in the prior amendment such as the information data storage means which provides for storing second related information which is a summary of the subject matter of the first related information. In response to a user instruction, for example, the related service search means includes a means for searching the information service data means and means for outputting to the user along with the schedule data the first and second related information. Moreover, Claim 1 continues to recite that the first and second related information are other than the scheduled data of another user.

The examiner has withdrawn the applicability of Yonemitsu (see "Response to Arguments" page 9, line 1-8 of the outstanding office action) pertaining to the recited limitation of using an internet-based search engine to search for the related information and has instead applied the Mansour reference and in particular column 5, lines 16-22 and column 5 lines 23-60.

Examining first Mansour column 5, line 16-22, it is stated therein:

The invention permits the schedule owner to manage the amount of time required to complete a task. The schedule owner selects the amount of time required to perform the task. In the preferred embodiment of the invention, the scheduling

tool displays a visual indicator showing a remaining amount of said selected time. In alternative embodiments, this indicator is aural.

The above portion of Mansour is not a very detailed description of the ability of a user to input the amount of time required to perform a given task. A more complete description may be found at column 4, lines 35-54 reproduced below:

FIG. 3 is a flowchart of the method for scheduling and time management, according to the invention. The schedule owner first inputs (100) the owner's schedule into the scheduling tool. The threshold amount of meetings is allocated (105). The schedule owner may optionally allocate the amount of time required to perform a task (110). The scheduling tool subsequently displays a visual indicator (115) showing the remaining amount of the allocated time. The scheduler then accesses the owner's schedule (120). The scheduling tool locates free time (125) and displays it, taking the threshold into account. If less than the schedule owner's threshold has been scheduled (130), the schedule owner's free time is scheduled in a default manner (140). The scheduler then sets a meeting (145). If the schedule owner's free time threshold has been exceeded (130), the schedule owner's free time is presented with an indicator signifying that the meeting threshold has been reached (135). The scheduler may then set a meeting (145), preferably during the free time and, more preferably, when no invitee's threshold has been reached.

As may be seen from the above quoted portions of Mansour, the user inputs into his/her scheduler the amount of time the user thinks it will take to do a particular task and the amount of time remaining to complete the task is displayed for convenience of the user. The Mansour teaching doesn't make it clear if this task, and the amount of time need to complete it, are related to a particular scheduled meeting (it probable is not since the meeting start and stop times are already specified) or to some independent task, perhaps a task the user is doing now – in advance of the meeting. At any rate, it is clear the it is the **user that simply inputs this amount of time** for which the “remaining time” may then be displayed and **this time is not obtained as a result of any interned-based search at all**. Since **Mansour does not teach any internet based search** used to obtain the “time” needed to perform the “task”, a

*fortiori*, **Mansour does not teach that an internet-based search is used to obtain the first information that is related to or based upon the user's scheduled data.**

The examiner also cites column 5, lines 16-22. This portion of Mansour states:

The invention may provide a visual or audio display of the schedule. Additionally, the scheduling tool may be configured to automatically connect the scheduler to one of an email, voice mail, or computer messaging.

Although the invention is described herein with reference to the preferred embodiment, one skilled in the art will readily appreciate that other applications may be substituted for those set forth herein without departing from the scope of the present invention.

The scheduling tool may readily be adapted to provide an audio display of said schedule. Thus, when a scheduler accesses a schedule, the schedule is provided as a sound file, for example, projected through the speakers of the scheduler's computer. The invention therefore permits users to leave the computer to perform other tasks while the requested schedule is accessed.

The invention may be interfaced to other software applications or electronic devices. For example, the invention may interface with a fax program. Thus, a fax may be sent at a time designated in the schedule.

The invention may also be interfaced with email, voicemail, or pager devices. As an example, the scheduler may be automatically connected to voicemail when the meeting threshold has been reached. The scheduler may thereby leave a message for the schedule owner explaining the purpose for the meeting.

In an alternative embodiment of the invention, the schedule is configured to restrict the scheduling of meetings according to scheduler. Thus, a manager may be permitted to schedule meetings at all times, while a sales representative may be restricted to scheduling meetings in the morning.

The invention may be configured to automatically identify the scheduler. For example, the invention is readily adapted to accept a password, or to identify a permission attached to the scheduler's computer access account.

The above discussion does not disclose the use of an internet based search to obtain applicant's recited first information. It must be recalled that Manour is concerned about **setting a threshold** such that meetings can **not be scheduled** beyond the threshold (say 3 hours/day) even if the schedule otherwise shows that the schedule is free. Thus, if the threshold value is exceeded (i.e., the user has already met for, say, the three hours on a give day), the person trying to hold a meeting will automatically be send to the desired person's e-mail, voice-mail or the like. In this manner, **the desired person will not be interrupted.** However, this use **of e-mail, voice mail and the like is not the same thing as performing an internet based search** for finding (and storing and outputting) the first information as recited in applicant's claim 1. While Mansour mentions using the internet generally, there is no detailed explanation of how the internet plays a role in Mansour's system. Apparently, a user may access his/her schedule or someone else's schedule using the internet (or intranet) and the scheduler tool. Even is this is true, such use does not teach applicant's claim limitations in which the internet is used to search for and obtain the first information that relates to and is based upon the user's scheduled data.

The above discussed limitations clearly differentiate applicant's invention from the combined teachings of Yonemitsu and Mansour. As discussed in the prior office action and agreed to by the examiner, Yonemitsu does not teach the above discussed limitations regarding using an internet-bases search to find the related (first) information. As shown herein, Mansour likewise does not disclose these limitations.

MPEP § 2143.03 states that "[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." In light of the difference discussed above, it is submitted that the PTO has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103 for claim 1.

Claims 3-18 are all dependent, directly or indirectly, upon independent Claim 1 and are thus deemed patentable at least for the same reasons indicated above with regard to Claim 1 from which they claims depend.

### **Conclusions**

It is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7-14-06

By David A. Blumenthal

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Washington Harbour  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143  
Telephone: (202) 672-5407  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,257